

AD-A196 609

DTIC FILE COPY

RR-88-24-ONR

(4)

## THE INFORMATION MATRIX IN LATENT-VARIABLE MODELS

Robert J. Mislevy  
and  
Kathleen M. Sheehan

This research was sponsored in part by the  
Cognitive Science Program  
Psychological Sciences Division  
Office of Naval Research, under  
Contract No. N00014-85-K-0683

Contract Authority Identification Number  
NR No. 150-539

Robert J. Mislevy, Principal Investigator



Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, New Jersey

April 1988

DTIC  
ELECTED  
S JUN 22 1988 D  
H

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for  
any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for public release; distribution  
unlimited.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

ADA196609

Form Approved  
OMB No 0704-0188

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			
1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	
2b DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) RR-88-24-ONR		5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Educational Testing Service	6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Cognitive Science Program, Office of Naval Research (Code 1142CS) 800 North Quincy Street	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)  Princeton, NJ 08541		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)  Arlington, VA 22217-5000	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-85-K-0683	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 61153N	PROJECT NO RR04204
		TASK NO RR04204-01	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO NR 150-539
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)  The Information Matrix in Latent-Variable Models (Unclassified)			
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Robert J. Mislevy and Kathleen M. Sheehan			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical	13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) April 1988	15 PAGE COUNT 27
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17 COSATI CODES		18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  Collateral information Missing information principle Item response theory Latent variables	
FIELD 05	GROUP 10		
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  The information matrix for the parameters in a latent-variable model is bounded from above by the information that would obtain if the values of the latent variables could also be observed. The difference is the "missing information." This paper discusses the structure of the information matrix, and characterizes the degree to which missing information can be recovered by exploiting collateral variables for respondents. The results are illustrated with data from the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery.			
20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. James Lester		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 202-696-4503	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ONR 1142CS

The Information Matrix in Latent-Variable Models<sup>1</sup>

Robert J. Mislevy

and

Kathleen M. Sheehan

Educational Testing Service

April 1988

<sup>1</sup>This work was supported by Contract No. N00014-85-K-0683, project designation NR 150-539, from the Cognitive Science Program, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research. The authors are grateful to Murray Aitkin and Charles Lewis for their comments and suggestions.

## The Information Matrix in Latent-Variable Models

### Abstract

The information matrix for the parameters in a latent-variable model is bounded from above by the information that would obtain if the values of the latent variables could also be observed. The difference is the "missing information." This paper discusses the structure of the information matrix, and characterizes the degree to which missing information can be recovered by exploiting collateral variables for respondents. The results are illustrated with data from the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery.

KEY WORDS: collateral information, item response theory, latent variables, missing information principle.



Accession For	
NAME GUARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DATA TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
UNIDENTIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUDGMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or Disl	Special
A-1	

## 1. Introduction

Latent variable models are used in the social sciences to provide parsimonious descriptions of the associations among observable variables in terms of theoretically derived constructs. Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)'$  denote observable variables,  $\theta$  denote latent variables, and  $\beta_1$  denote parameters of the regressions of the  $x_j$ 's on  $\theta$  through the known functions  $f_j(x_j | \theta, \beta_1)$ . Under the assumption of conditional independence,

$$f(\mathbf{x} | \theta, \beta_1) = \prod_j f_j(x_j | \theta, \beta_1).$$

If  $g(\theta | \beta_2)$  is the density function of  $\theta$  in a population of interest, then the density of the observed variables is given by the mixture

$$h(\mathbf{x} | \beta) = \int f(\mathbf{x} | \theta, \beta_1) g(\theta | \beta_2) d\theta ,$$

where  $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ . For notational convenience, we shall suppress dependence on  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  in  $f$ ,  $g$ ,  $h$ , and elsewhere.

Some examples of latent-variable models follow:

- o An item response theory (IRT) model for an  $n$ -item educational test gives the probability that an examinee will respond correctly to item  $j$  rather than 0 as a function of (i) an unobservable scalar  $\theta$  characterizing the proficiency of the examinee and (ii) a possibly vector-valued parameter  $\beta_{1j}$

characterizing the regression of  $x_j$  on  $\theta$  (Lord 1980). In this case, there is a distinct subparameter  $\beta_{1j}$  for each item, so that  $\beta_1 = (\beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{1n})$ .

- o In factor analysis models (Thurstone 1948), the "factor loadings"  $\beta_{1j}$  of the observed variable  $x_j$  are coefficients of its linear regression on unobservable trait values  $\theta$ . It is often assumed that  $g$  is a standardized multivariate normal density.
- o In latent class models (Lazarsfeld 1950),  $\beta_1$  implies response probabilities for items from members of classes 1 through K, but respondents' class memberships  $\theta$  are not observed. Their distribution  $g$  is multinomial, with parameters  $\beta_2$ .

This paper concerns the structure of information matrices that arise in the estimation of  $\beta$ . If values of latent variables are construed as missing data (as in Dempster, Laird, and Rubin 1977), the expected information matrix associated with estimating  $\beta$  from values of  $x$  is bounded from above by the expected information that would obtain if values of  $\theta$  were observed as well (Orchard and Woodbury 1972). The difference is "missing information." We aim to characterize this loss, and to demonstrate how covariates, or collateral variables  $y$  for respondents, can be used to recover some of the missing information for  $\beta_1$ . The following section gives background and notation for latent variables models. Subsequent sections discuss expected information in maximum likelihood (ML) estimation of  $\beta$ .

from  $\mathbf{x}$ , then in estimation from  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $y$ . Results are then presented for observed information matrices. Finally, a numerical illustration with data from the Profile of American Youth (U.S. Department of Defense 1982) is given.

## 2. Background and Notation

In the terminology of Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977), estimating  $\beta$  from a sample of  $N$  independent observations of  $(\theta, \mathbf{x})$  is a "complete-data" problem. The loglikelihood for  $\beta$  is

$$\lambda_{\theta, \mathbf{x}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \ln [f(\mathbf{x}_i | \theta_i, \beta_1) g(\theta_i | \beta_2)] . \quad (2.1)$$

Assume that both  $f$  and  $g$  are twice-differentiable, and define the gradient vector  $s(\theta, \mathbf{x})$  for  $\beta$  for the loglikelihood of a single observation by

$$s(\theta, \mathbf{x}) = [s^1(\theta, \mathbf{x}), s^2(\theta, \mathbf{x})] \\ = [\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_1} \ln f(\mathbf{x} | \theta, \beta_1), \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_2} \ln g(\theta | \beta_2)] . \quad (2.2)$$

Under regularity conditions, the MLE  $\hat{\beta}$  solves the likelihood equation

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^N s(\theta_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$$

and for large  $N$  is approximately multivariate normal in repeated samples, with mean  $\beta$  and covariance given by the inverse of the

expected information matrix  $N I_{\theta X}$ . Using the fact that  $E_{X\theta}(s)=0$ , we further our purpose by writing  $I_{\theta X}$  in the following manner:

$$I_{\theta X} = \iint s(\theta, x) s'(\theta, x) p(\theta|x, \beta) d\theta h(x|\beta) dx$$

[where  $p(\theta|x, \beta)$  is obtained by Bayes theorem as  $f(x|\theta)g(\theta)/h(x)$ ]

$$= E_X[E_\theta(ss' | x)]$$

$$= \text{Var}_{X\theta}(s) .$$

Let  $I_{\theta X}^1 = \text{Var}_{X\theta}(s^1)$  denote the block of the information matrix that pertains to  $\beta_1$ , and note that (2.2) implies that the off-diagonal block of  $I_{\theta X}$  for elements of  $\beta_1$  and those of  $\beta_2$  is zero.

Suppose that collateral variables  $y$  such as educational or demographic status could also be observed for respondents, and let  $p(y|\gamma)$  denote their density in a population of interest. In an extension of conditional independence, it is desirable to posit that

$$f(x|\theta, \beta_1, y) = f(x|\theta, \beta_1) ; \quad (2.3)$$

that is,  $\theta$  also explains the associations among observed responses  $x$  and collateral variables. (See Thissen, Steinberg, and Wainer 1987 on how this assumption can be tested in the context of IRT.)

When (2.3) holds, the joint density of  $(x, \theta, y)$  is

$$p(\mathbf{x}, \theta, y | \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma) = f(\mathbf{x} | \theta, \beta_1) g(\theta | y, \beta_2) p(y | \gamma).$$

(Note the slight change in the meaning of  $g$ ; in a similar manner,  $h$  becomes  $h(\mathbf{x}|y, \beta)$  when collateral variables are present.) As long as  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ , and  $\gamma$  are distinct, the loglikelihood induced by observing  $y$  along with  $\theta$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  is equal to (2.1) plus a constant insofar as  $\beta$  is concerned. Moreover,

$$I_{\theta XY}^1 = I_{\theta X}^1, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$I_{\theta XY}^1 = E_Y E_X E_\theta(s^1 s^{1'} | \mathbf{x}, y) = \text{Var}_{YX\theta}(s^1). \quad .$$

Since the off-diagonal blocks of  $I_{\theta XY}^1$  for elements of  $\beta_1$  with those of both  $\beta_2$  and  $\gamma$  are zero, it can be concluded that observing  $y$  provides no additional information about  $\beta_1$  if both  $\theta$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  are also observed.

### 3. Estimating $\beta$ from $\mathbf{x}$

Of course it is never possible to observe  $\theta$ . But, since  $\theta$  is missing for all respondents regardless of the values of  $\theta$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ , it can be considered missing data that is "missing completely at random," and appropriate likelihood and sampling distribution inferences follow by marginalizing over  $\theta$  in the complete-data likelihood (Little and Rubin 1987). It is common practice to

estimate  $\beta$  from values of  $\mathbf{x}$  alone--ignoring  $\mathbf{y}$  even if it is available--by maximizing the "incomplete-data" loglikelihood

$$\lambda_X = \sum_i \ln h(\mathbf{x}_i | \beta) = \ln [E_\theta(\exp \lambda_{\theta X} | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N; \beta)] .$$

(In the context of IRT, Bock and Aitkin 1981 refer to this procedure as "marginal maximum likelihood" estimation.) Again under regularity conditions, the MLE solves what is now an "incomplete-data" likelihood equation  $0 = \partial \lambda_X / \partial \beta$ . Provided differentials can be passed through the integral,

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_X}{\partial \beta} = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \ln h(\mathbf{x}_i | \beta)$$

$$= \sum_i \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} [f(\mathbf{x}_i | \theta, \beta_1) g(\theta | \beta_2)] h^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_i | \beta) d\theta$$

$$= \sum_i \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} [\ln f(\mathbf{x}_i | \theta, \beta_1) g(\theta | \beta_2)] f(\mathbf{x}_i | \theta) g(\theta) h^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_i) d\theta$$

$$= \sum_i \int s(\theta, \mathbf{x}_i) p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, \beta) d\theta$$

$$= \sum_i E_\theta(s | \mathbf{x}_i) .$$

Accordingly, the incomplete-data information matrix is  $N I_X$ , where

$$I_X = E_X[E_\theta(s | \mathbf{x}) E_\theta(s' | \mathbf{x})] - \text{Var}_X[E_\theta(s | \mathbf{x})] ,$$

the final equality using  $E_X[E_\theta(s|x)] = 0$ .  $I_X$  is related to  $I_{\theta X}$  through a decomposition of variance--an instance of Orchard and Woodbury's (1972) "missing information principle:"

$$I_{\theta X} = \text{Var}_X[E_\theta(s|x)] + E_X[\text{Var}_\theta(s|x)] \\ = I_X + I_{\theta|X} . \quad (3.1)$$

$I_{\theta|X}$ , the missing information, is the average variance of the complete-data gradient vector given  $x$  but not  $\theta$ ; that is, variation in  $s$  over possible values of  $\theta$  that could give rise to observed data  $x$ , averaged over  $x$ . If the variance of  $p(\theta|x, \beta)$  were zero for all  $x$ --loosely speaking, if  $x$  determined  $\theta$  with complete accuracy--then  $\text{Var}_\theta(s|x) = 0$  for all  $x$ , and no information would be lost as a result of not observing  $\theta$ . If values of  $\theta$  are not completely determined by  $x$ , this variance increases and information about  $\beta$  is decreased. The proportional decrease, from diagonal elements of  $I_{\theta X}$  to those of  $I_X$ , need not be the same for all elements of  $\beta$ .

#### 4. Estimating $\beta$ from $x$ and $y$

When collateral variables  $y$  are available for respondents, the extended incomplete-data loglikelihood is

$$\lambda_{XY} = \sum_i \ln [h(x_i|\beta) p(y_i|\gamma)] \\ = \ln [E_\theta(\exp \lambda_{\theta X}|x_1, y_1, \dots, x_N, y_N; \beta)] + \sum_i \ln p(y_i|\gamma) .$$

As long as  $\beta$  is distinct from  $\gamma$ , the shape of the likelihood surface with respect to  $\beta$  involves only the first term--the conditional distribution of the  $\mathbf{x}$ s, given the observed values of the  $y$ s. In particular, the likelihood equation for  $\beta$  is

$$0 = \partial \lambda_{XY} / \partial \beta, \text{ where}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \lambda_{XY}}{\partial \beta} &= \sum_i \int s(\theta, \mathbf{x}_i) p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \beta) d\theta \\ &= \sum_i E_\theta(s | \mathbf{x}_i, y_i),\end{aligned}$$

with  $p(\theta | \mathbf{x}, y, \beta) = f(\mathbf{x} | \theta, \beta_1) g(\theta | y, \beta_2) / h(\mathbf{x} | y, \beta)$ . The asymptotic distribution of the MLE under repeated samples of  $N(\mathbf{x}, y)$  pairs does involve the distribution of  $y$ , however. The block of the information matrix for  $(\beta, \gamma)$  that pertains to  $\beta$  is  $N I_{XY}$ , where

$$I_{XY} = E_Y E_X [E_\theta(s | \mathbf{x}, y) E_\theta(s' | \mathbf{x}, y)] = \text{Var}_{YX}[E_\theta(s | \mathbf{x}, y)].$$

Large sample ML inferences about  $\beta$  under repeated sampling of  $(\mathbf{x}, y)$  can be based on this block alone, since the off-diagonal block pertaining to the crossing of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  is zero. (Section 5 concerns repeated samples of  $N(\mathbf{x}, y)$  values with the  $y$ s fixed at prespecified values.)

We now focus on the effect of including  $y$  upon information about  $\beta_1$ . Expressions for the  $I_X^1$  block suffice, since the nullity of the off-diagonal block in  $I_{\Theta X}$  implies the nullity of the corresponding block in  $I_X$  (see Appendix). Using (2.4) and applying the missing information principle,

$$I_{\theta X}^1 = I_{XY}^1 + I_{\theta|XY}^1$$

where

$$I_{\theta|XY}^1 = E_X E_Y [\text{Var}_{\theta}(s^1|x,y)] .$$

As in (3.1), the missing information corresponds to a loss in the precision with which  $\beta_1$  can be estimated. The loss is expressed as expected variation of  $s^1$  over possible values of the latent variable  $\theta$ , conditional now on values of  $y$  as well as those of  $x$ .

Intuitively, less information should be lost if  $y$  is observed along with  $x$ . An expression for how much of the missing information has been recovered begins with another decomposition of the total variation in  $s^1$ . Since

$$I_{\theta X}^1 = I_{\theta XY}^1 - \text{Var}_{XY\theta}(s^1) ,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\theta X}^1 &= \text{Var}_X [E_Y E_{\theta}(s^1)] + E_X (\text{Var}_Y [E_{\theta}(s^1)]) + E_X E_Y [\text{Var}_{\theta}(s^1)] \\ &\quad - I_X^1 + I_{Y|X}^1 + I_{\theta|XY}^1 . \end{aligned}$$

$I_X^1$  is the variance in expected values of  $s^1$  over  $x$ , averaging over  $y$  and  $\theta$ .  $I_{Y|X}^1$  is the expected variance of the average values of  $s^1$  with respect to  $\theta$  as  $y$  varies. It represents variation in

$E_\theta(s^1)$  explained by  $y$  beyond that explained by  $x$ .  $I_{\theta|XY}^1$  is the expected variation in  $s^1$  remaining unexplained after both  $x$  and  $y$  have been accounted for.

The portion of missing information about  $\beta_1$  that is recovered by using  $y$ , then, is  $I_{XY}^1 - I_X^1 = I_{Y|X}^1$ --another application of the missing information principle, with  $(x,y)$  treated as the complete data and  $x$  as the incomplete data. When  $y$  and  $\theta$  are independent, this term is zero because for each  $x$ ,  $E_\theta(s^1)$  takes the same value at all values of  $y$ . No information about  $\beta_1$  is lost by ignoring  $y$  in this case. When  $y$  and  $\theta$  are not independent, the degree to which information about  $\beta_1$  increases depends not simply upon the strength of their relationship, but on the strength of their relationship conditional on  $x$ . There is less to be gained by using collateral information when  $\theta$  is already well determined by  $x$  alone.

These results indicate that greater benefit accrues from using collateral information as it relates more strongly to the latent variable, and as less information is available from the observed responses  $x$ . Mislevy's (1987) analyses in the context of item response theory indicate that in typical applications of educational and psychological testing, readily available collateral variables such as educational and demographic data can often account for a third of the population variance, and increase the precision of  $\beta_1$  roughly as much as two to six additional test items. This gain is substantial in applications such as educational assessment or attitudinal surveys, where a subject

might be administered only five or ten items; it is potentially useful in adaptive testing, where he might receive fifteen well-chosen items. The proportional gain is not impressive with individual achievement tests, where test lengths of 60 to 100 items are common.

### 5. "Conditional Expected" Information

The preceding sections concern information matrices that require marginalization over the sample spaces of both  $x$  and  $y$ . They reflect the point of view one has before observing either  $x$  or  $y$  values. This section presents results for expected information conditional on given values of  $y$ .

Expected information conditional on  $y$  is pertinent to the problem of experimental design, for example. If it is possible to stratify on  $y$  when gathering data, expected information for various combinations of  $y$  values can be compared to choose an optimal sampling scheme. This requires expectations over  $x$  conditional on fixed values of  $y$ . Let  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$  be a vector of  $N$  specified values of  $y$ . Define the mixture density

$$p_y(\theta | \beta_2) = N^{-1} \sum_i^N g(\theta | y_i, \beta_2) ,$$

which represents the marginal density of  $\theta$  in samples drawn in accordance with  $y$ . The complete-data expected information matrix

that corresponds to this density is defined analogously to  $I_{\theta X}$  in Section 3, as

$$I_{\theta X(y)} = \iint s(\theta, x) s'(\theta, x) p_y(\theta | x, \beta) d\theta h_y(x | \beta) dx , \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$h_y(x | \beta) = \int f(x | \theta, \beta_1) p_y(\theta | \beta_2) d\theta$$

and

$$p_y(\theta | x, \beta) = f(x | \theta, \beta_1) p_y(\theta | \beta_2) / h_y(x | \beta) .$$

$I_{\theta X(y)}$  is the expected information about  $\beta$  corresponding to repeated observations of  $(x, \theta)$  sampled in accordance with  $y$ . When, as in practice, observations consist of  $(x, y)$ , one can calculate expected information when estimation ignores  $y$  values and when estimation uses  $y$  values. These are, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{X(y)} &= \int [\int s p_y(\theta | x, \beta) d\theta] [\int s' p_y(\theta | x, \beta) d\theta] h_y(x | \beta) dx \\ &= E_{X(y)} [\text{Var}_{\theta(y)}(s | x)] \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$I_{Xy} = N^{-1} \sum_i^N [E_{\theta}(s | x, y_i) E_{\theta}(s' | x, y_i)] h(x | y_i, \beta) dx$$

$$= E_y E_{X|y} [\text{Var}_\theta(s|x,y)] . \quad (5.3)$$

By the missing information principle, the gain in information about  $\beta_1$  expected when exploiting  $y$  for this particular value of  $y$ , or  $I_{Xy}^1 - I_{X(y)}^1$ , is at least positive semidefinite.

## 6. Observed Information

The expected matrices discussed in the preceding sections are functions of the true values of  $\beta$ . In practice, they are sometimes approximated by substituting maximum likelihood estimates  $\hat{\beta}$  for  $\beta$ . The resulting "estimated expected information matrices" are consistent estimates of the desired values. They are to be distinguished, however, from "observed information" matrices.

An observed information matrix is the negative inverse of the second derivative matrix of the loglikelihood, calculated with maximizing value  $\hat{\beta}$ , the observed responses  $(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ , and, if required,  $(y_1, \dots, y_N)$ . Observed information reflects the point of view after  $N$  sampled values of both  $x$  and  $y$  have been observed, and indicates the precision with which  $\beta$  has been estimated from the realized sample (Efron and Hinkley 1978). In a large-sample normal approximation to the posterior distribution of  $\beta$  under Bayesian inference, the posterior variance is the negative inverse of the observed information.

Define the complete-data second derivative  $d(\theta, x)$  as  $\partial s(\theta, x)/\partial\beta'$ . Using Louis' (1982) expressions for observed information in missing data problems,

$$N I_x = \sum_i^N [\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, \hat{\beta}) d\theta - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s s' p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, \hat{\beta}) d\theta]$$

and

$$N I_{xy} = \sum_i^N [\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \hat{\beta}) d\theta - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s s' p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \hat{\beta}) d\theta]$$

In contrast to results with expected information, the off-diagonal blocks of  $I_x$  and  $I_{xy}$  for the crossing of  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  need not be zero. Moreover, the appealing decomposition of expected information into variance components of  $s$  does not carry over to observed information; it depended on the fact that  $E(ss')=E(d)$ . For unfortunate combinations of  $x$  and  $y$  values,  $I_x$  can exceed  $I_{xy}$  in some or even all diagonal elements. Inasmuch as observed information is quite generally a consistent estimate of expected information, however, the results of Section 4 suggest that one would expect to find the greater diagonal entries in  $I_{xy}$  more often than not.

## 7. A Numerical Illustration

This section illustrates the ideas developed above in the context of an item response theory (IRT) model for mental test data. The values of  $I_{\theta X(y)}^1$ ,  $I_{X(y)}^1$ , and  $I_{xy}^1$ --the quantities relevant to "conditional expected information"--are approximated here by evaluating (5.1) through (5.3) with  $\hat{\beta}$  in place of  $\beta$ .

### 7.1 The Data

Observed responses  $\mathbf{x}$  are vectors of responses to four items from the Arithmetic Reasoning test of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), Form 8A, as observed in the sample of respondents from the survey Profile of American Youth (U.S. Department of Defense 1982) whose data are reported by Mislevy (1986). Response counts are shown in Table 1 for the  $N=776$  respondents as a whole, and as broken down into the four categories of a demographic design with subsample sizes  $N_y$  of 263, 228, 140, and 145. A correct response is indicated by a 1, an incorrect response by a 0.

Table 1 about here

### 7.2 The Model

Using the numerical procedure described in Mislevy (1987), the 2-parameter logistic (2PL) IRT model was fit to the response counts in Table 1 by maximizing a loglikelihood of the form of (2.1). Under the usual IRT assumption of conditional independence, and with  $\beta_1$  representing the item parameters  $(a_1, b_1, \dots, a_4, b_4)$ , we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}|\theta, \beta_1) = \prod_{j=1}^4 \exp[1.7a_j x_j (\theta - b_j)] / (1 + \exp[1.7a_j (\theta - b_j)]),$$

or, equivalently,

$$= \prod_j P_j(\theta)^{x_j} Q_j(\theta)^{1-x_j},$$

where  $P_j(\theta) = f_j(x_j=1|\theta, a_j, b_j)$  and  $Q_j(\theta) = 1 - P_j(\theta)$ . The parameters  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  give the (linear) regression of the logit of  $x_j$  on  $\theta$ . Normal densities were assumed for  $g(\theta|y, \beta_2)$ , for  $y = 1, \dots, 4$ . The population parameters  $\beta_2 = (\mu_1, \sigma_1, \dots, \mu_4, \sigma_4)$  were constrained in order to make the model identified, by incorporating the computationally convenient constraints  $\sum \mu_y = 0$  and  $\sum (\sigma_y^2 + \mu_y^2)/4 = 1$ . The resulting MLE's are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

From this point on, the MLEs shown in Table 2 will be treated as known true values for the purpose of approximating expected information matrices. Using the results of Section 5, expected information matrices will be calculated conditional on the observed subsample proportions  $p(y) = (.339, .294, .180, .187)$ . The density  $p_y(\theta)$  that obtains after fixing  $y$  in this manner is thus a mixture of four normal components:

$$p_y(\theta|\beta_2) = \sum_{y=1}^4 g(\theta|\mu_y, \sigma_y) p(y).$$

Values of  $y$  account for about 18-percent of the variation of  $\theta$  in the mixture.

### 7.3 Formulae

Let  $u_j$  be an element of  $\beta_1$ . Let  $w_j(\theta)$  take the value  $1.7(\theta - b_j)$  if  $u_j = a_j$ , and the value  $-1.7a_j$  if  $u_j = b_j$ . The element of the complete-data gradient vector corresponding to  $u_j$  is

$$s(u_j; \theta, x) = [x_j - p_j(\theta)] w_j(\theta) .$$

Computing expected information requires the expected count of each response pattern  $x_\ell = (x_{\ell 1}, \dots, x_{\ell 4})$ . In subpopulation  $y$ , this value is

$$\hat{N}_{\ell y} = N_y \int f(x_\ell | \theta, \beta_1) g(\theta | \mu_y, \sigma_y) d\theta .$$

For the undifferentiated population (given the observed values of  $y$ ) as a whole,  $\hat{N}_\ell = \sum \hat{N}_{\ell y}$ . These values are given in Table 3.

---

Table 3 about here

---

Expected information matrices are now obtained as follows:

$$I_{\theta X(y)}^1 = \sum_\ell \hat{N}_\ell \int s_\ell^1 s_\ell^{1'} p_y(\theta | x_\ell) d\theta ,$$

where  $s_\ell^1 = s^1(\theta, x_\ell)$  and  $p_y(\theta | x_\ell) = f(x_\ell | \theta, \beta_1) p_y(\theta | \beta_2) / h_y(x | \beta)$ ;

$$I_{X(y)}^1 = \sum_{\ell} \hat{N}_{\ell} [ \int s_{\ell}^1 p_y(\theta | x_{\ell}) d\theta ] [ \int s_{\ell}' p_y(\theta | x_{\ell}) d\theta ] ;$$

and

$$I_{Xy}^1 = \sum_{\ell y} \hat{N}_{\ell y} [ \int s_{\ell}^1 p(\theta | x_{\ell}, y) d\theta ] [ \int s_{\ell}' p(\theta | x_{\ell}, y) d\theta ] ,$$

where  $p(\theta | x_{\ell}, y) = f(x_{\ell} | \theta, \beta_1) p(\theta | \beta_2, y) / h(x_{\ell} | y, \beta)$ .

#### 7.4 Results

Tables 4, 5, and 6 present  $I_{\theta X(y)}^1$ ,  $I_{X(y)}^1$ , and  $I_{Xy}^1$ . These matrices are block-diagonal, with only off-diagonal elements for the a and b parameters of a given item taking possibly non-zero values. The proportions of effective information and partial recovery for the diagonal elements are summarized in Table 7. Compared to the information expected if  $(x, \theta)$  were observed, the degree of information expected when only  $x$  is observed averages 36-percent for a parameters and 85-percent for b parameters. Using  $(x, y)$  yields corresponding values of 40-percent and 87-percent. Averaging over item-level results, the degree to which missing information is recoverable (for the observed values of y) is 7-percent for a's and 17-percent for b's.

---

Tables 4-7 about here

---

### References

- Bock, R.D., and Aitkin, M. (1981) Marginal maximum likelihood estimation of item parameters: An application of an EM algorithm. Psychometrika, 46, 443-459.
- Dempster, A.P., Laird, N.M., and Rubin,D.B. (1977) Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm (with discussion). Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 39, 1-38.
- Efron, B., and Hinkley, D.V. (1978) Assessing the accuracy of the maximum likelihood estimator: Observed versus expected Fisher information. Biometrika, 65, 457-487.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1950) The logical and mathematical foundation of latent structure analysis. In Stouffer, S.A., et al (Eds.), Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. IV: Measurement and Prediction. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Little, R.J.A., and Rubin, D.B. (1987) Statistical analysis with Missing Data. New York: Wiley.
- Lord, F.M. (1980) Applications of Item Response Theory to Practical Testing Problems. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Louis, T.A. (1982) Finding the observed information matrix when using the EM algorithm. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 44, 226-233.
- Mislevy, R.J. (1985) Estimation of latent group effects. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 80, 993-997.

- Mislevy, R.J. (1987) Exploiting auxiliary information about examinees in the estimation of item parameters. Applied Psychological Measurement, 11, 81-91.
- Orchard, T., and Woodbury, M.A. (1972) A missing information principle: Theory and applications. Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thissen, D., Steinberg, L., and Wainer, H. (1987) Use of item response theory in the study of group differences in trace lines. In H. Wainer and H. Braun (Eds.), Test Validity. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thurstone, L.L. (1948) Multiple Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- U.S. Department of Defense (1982) Profile of American Youth. Washington D.C.: Author (Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics).

## Appendix

Section 4 uses the large-sample result that if the off-diagonal block in  $I_{\theta X}$  corresponding to the crossing of  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  is null, so is the corresponding block in  $I_X$ . This appendix gives a heuristic argument in support of that claim. Since the observed information matrix  $I_X$  introduced in Section 6 is a consistent estimate of  $I_X$ , it suffices to show that the expectation of the off-diagonal block in  $I_X$  is null.

From Section 6,

$$N I_X = \sum_i^N [\int (-d) p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, \hat{\beta}) d\theta - \int s s' p(\theta | \mathbf{x}_i, \hat{\beta}) d\theta] .$$

Substituting  $\hat{\beta}$  for  $\beta$ , and taking expectation over  $\mathbf{x}$  gives

$$E_{\mathbf{X}} I_X = E_{\mathbf{X}}[E_{\theta}(-d)] - E_{\mathbf{X}}[E_{\theta}(ss')] . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

It is clear from (2.2) that the off-diagonal block of  $d$  is null for all  $\mathbf{x}$  and all  $\theta$ , so the corresponding block of the first term on the right of (A.1) is null. The second term is  $\text{Var}_{\theta X}(s)$ , or  $I_{\theta X}$ , which, from Section 2, also has a null off-diagonal block. The off-diagonal block of the matrix difference between the two terms must be null too.

Table 1  
Observed Counts of Response Patterns

Response				y				Total
1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
0	0	0	0	23	20	27	29	99
0	0	0	1	5	8	5	8	26
0	0	1	0	12	14	15	7	48
0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	10
0	1	0	0	16	20	16	14	66
0	1	0	1	3	5	5	5	18
0	1	1	0	6	11	4	6	27
0	1	1	1	1	7	3	0	11
1	0	0	0	22	23	15	14	74
1	0	0	1	6	8	10	10	34
1	0	1	0	7	9	8	11	35
1	0	1	1	19	6	1	2	28
1	1	0	0	21	18	7	19	65
1	1	0	1	11	15	9	5	40
1	1	1	0	23	20	10	8	61
1	1	1	1	86	42	2	4	134
Total				263	228	140	145	776

Table 2  
Maximum Likelihood Estimates of  $\beta$

Item	$a_j$	$b_j$	y-value	$\mu_y$	$\sigma_y$
1	1.006	-.421	1	.485	1.164
2	.672	-.213	2	.073	.855
3	.775	.139	3	-.513	.642
4	.834	.402	4	-.502	.640

Table 3  
Expected Counts of Response Patterns

Response				y				Total
1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
0	0	0	0	27.17	27.85	31.70	32.34	119.06
0	0	0	1	4.88	5.81	5.37	5.54	21.60
0	0	1	0	7.55	8.97	8.46	8.73	33.71
0	0	1	1	3.16	3.56	2.31	2.41	11.44
0	1	0	0	12.76	15.04	14.69	15.13	57.62
0	1	0	1	4.80	5.49	3.77	3.92	17.98
0	1	1	0	7.07	8.15	5.77	6.00	26.99
0	1	1	1	6.00	5.55	2.35	2.46	16.36
1	0	0	0	15.72	18.75	16.23	16.79	67.48
1	0	0	1	8.38	8.95	5.08	5.31	27.72
1	0	1	0	12.04	13.04	7.68	8.01	40.77
1	0	1	1	14.77	11.66	3.80	3.99	34.22
1	1	0	0	17.86	19.80	12.37	12.90	62.93
1	1	0	1	19.51	16.26	5.76	6.05	47.58
1	1	1	0	26.58	22.79	8.46	8.88	66.71
1	1	1	1	74.75	36.33	6.20	6.55	123.83
Total				263.00	228.00	140.00	145.00	776.00

Table 4  
Expected Complete-Data Information

	$a_1$	$b_1$	$a_2$	$b_2$	$a_3$	$b_3$	$a_4$	$b_4$
a	176.75		290.81		254.24		249.38	
b	-68.60	371.64	-37.80	201.01	31.42	250.70	75.89	267.98

Note: Only diagonal blocks are shown; all other entries are zero.

Table 5  
Expected Incomplete-Data Information, Ignoring y

	$a_1$	$b_1$	$a_2$	$b_2$	$a_3$	$b_3$	$a_4$	$b_4$
a	51.76		114.82		90.72		95.65	
b	-55.09	298.63	-31.91	179.77	31.70	215.75	70.80	224.58

Note: Only diagonal blocks are shown; all other entries are zero.

Table 6  
Expected Incomplete-Data Information, Using y

	$a_1$	$b_1$	$a_2$	$b_2$	$a_3$	$b_3$	$a_4$	$b_4$
a	53.39		119.79		105.18		116.72	
b	-46.78	308.91	-22.49	183.28	44.33	222.03	85.86	232.98

Note: Only diagonal blocks are shown; all other entries are zero.

Table 7  
Recovery of Missing Information (Diagonal Elements)

	$a_1$	$a_2$	$a_3$	$a_4$	average
$I_{X(y)}/I_{\Theta X(y)}$	.29	.39	.36	.38	.36
$I_{Xy}/I_{\Theta X(y)}$	.30	.41	.41	.47	.40
$\frac{I_{Xy} - I_{X(y)}}{I_{\Theta X(y)} - I_{X(y)}}$	.01	.03	.09	.14	.07
	$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	average
$I_{X(y)}/I_{\Theta X(y)}$	.80	.89	.86	.84	.85
$I_{Xy}/I_{\Theta X(y)}$	.83	.91	.89	.87	.87
$\frac{I_{Xy} - I_{X(y)}}{I_{\Theta X(y)} - I_{X(y)}}$	.14	.17	.18	.19	.17

Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Dr. Terry Ackerman  
American College Testing Programs  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Robert Ahlers  
Code N711  
Human Factors Laboratory  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. James Algina  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32605

Dr. Erling B. Andersen  
Department of Statistics  
Studiestraede 6  
1455 Copenhagen  
DENMARK

Dr. Eva L. Baker  
UCLA Center for the Study  
of Evaluation  
145 Moore Hall  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Isaac Bejar  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08450

Dr. Menucha Birenbaum  
School of Education  
Tel Aviv University  
Tel Aviv, Ramat Aviv 69978  
ISRAEL

Dr. Arthur S. Blaiwes  
Code N711  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Bruce Bloxom  
Defense Manpower Data Center  
550 Camino El Estero,  
Suite 200  
Monterey, CA 93943-3231

Dr. R. Darrell Bock  
University of Chicago  
NORC  
6030 South Ellis  
Chicago, IL 60637

Cdt. Arnold Bohrer  
Sectie Psychologisch Onderzoek  
Rekruterings-En Selectiecentrum  
Kwartier Koningen Astrid  
Bruijnstraat  
1120 Brussels, BELGIUM

Dr. Robert Breaux  
Code N-095R  
Naval Training Systems Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert Brennan  
American College Testing  
Programs  
P. O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Lyle D. Broemeling  
ONR Code 1111SP  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Mr. James W. Carey  
Commandant (G-PTE)  
U.S. Coast Guard  
2100 Second Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20593

Dr. James Carlson  
American College Testing  
Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. John B. Carroll  
409 Elliott Rd.  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. Robert Carroll  
OP 0187  
Washington, DC 20370

Mr. Raymond E. Christal  
AFHRL/MOE  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank  
Performance Metrics, Inc.  
5825 Callaghan  
Suite 225  
San Antonio, TX 78228

Dr. Pat Federico  
Code 511  
NPRDC  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Leonard Feldt  
Lindquist Center  
for Measurement  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Richard L. Ferguson  
American College Testing  
Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240

Dr. Gerhard Fischer  
Liebiggasse 5/3  
A 1010 Vienna  
AUSTRIA

Dr. Myron Fischl  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Prof. Donald Fitzgerald  
University of New England  
Department of Psychology  
Armidale, New South Wales 2351  
AUSTRALIA

Mr. Paul Foley  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Alfred R. Fregly  
AFOSR/NL  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Robert D. Gibbons  
Illinois State Psychiatric Inst.  
Rm 529W  
1601 W. Taylor Street  
Chicago, IL 60612

Dr. Janice Gifford  
University of Massachusetts  
School of Education  
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Robert Glaser  
Learning Research  
& Development Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Bert Green  
Johns Hopkins University  
Department of Psychology  
Charles & 34th Street  
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dipl. Pad. Michael W. Habon  
Universitat Dusseldorf  
Erziehungswissenschaftliches  
Universitatsstr. 1  
D-4000 Dusseldorf 1  
WEST GERMANY

Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton  
Prof. of Education & Psychology  
University of Massachusetts  
at Amherst  
Hills House  
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Delwyn Harnisch  
University of Illinois  
51 Gerty Drive  
Champaign, IL 61820

Ms. Rebecca Hetter  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 62  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Paul W. Holland  
Educational Testing Service  
Rosedale Road  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Prof. Lutz F. Hornke  
Institut fur Psychologie  
RWTH Aachen  
Jaegerstrasse 17/19  
D-5100 Aachen  
WEST GERMANY

## Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Dr. Paul Horst  
677 G Street, #184  
Chula Vista, CA 90010

Mr. Dick Hoshaw  
OP-135  
Arlington Annex  
Room 2834  
Washington, DC 20350

Dr. Lloyd Humphreys  
University of Illinois  
Department of Psychology  
603 East Daniel Street  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Steven Hunka  
Department of Education  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA

Dr. Huynh Huynh  
College of Education  
Univ. of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Robert Jannarone  
Department of Psychology  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Dennis E. Jennings  
Department of Statistics  
University of Illinois  
1409 West Green Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Douglas H. Jones  
Thatcher Jones Associates  
P.O. Box 6640  
10 Trafalgar Court  
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

Dr. Milton S. Katz  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Prof. John A. Keats  
Department of Psychology  
University of Newcastle  
N.S.W. 2308  
AUSTRALIA

Dr. G. Gage Kingsbury  
Portland Public Schools  
Research and Evaluation Department  
501 North Dixon Street  
P. O. Box 3107  
Portland, OR 97209-3107

Dr. William Koch  
University of Texas-Austin  
Measurement and Evaluation  
Center  
Austin, TX 78703

Dr. James Kraatz  
Computer-based Education  
Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Leonard Kroeker  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Daryll Lang  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Jerry Lehnus  
Defense Manpower Data Center  
Suite 400  
1600 Wilson Blvd  
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Dr. Thomas Leonard  
University of Wisconsin  
Department of Statistics  
1210 West Dayton Street  
Madison, WI 53705

Dr. Michael Levine  
Educational Psychology  
210 Education Bldg.  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61801

## Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Dr. Charles Lewis  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Robert Linn  
College of Education  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Robert Lockman  
Center for Naval Analysis  
4401 Ford Avenue  
P.O. Box 16268  
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Dr. Frederic M. Lord  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Milton Maier  
Center for Naval Analysis  
4401 Ford Avenue  
P.O. Box 16268  
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Dr. William L. Maloy  
Chief of Naval Education  
and Training  
Naval Air Station  
Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. Gary Marco  
Stop 31-E  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Clessen Martin  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Blvd.  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. James McBride  
Psychological Corporation  
c/o Harcourt, Brace,  
Javanovich Inc.  
1250 West 6th Street  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dr. Clarence McCormick  
HQ, MEPCOM  
MEPCT-P  
2500 Green Bay Road  
North Chicago, IL 60064

Dr. George B. Macready  
Department of Measurement  
Statistics & Evaluation  
College of Education  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Robert McKinley  
Educational Testing Service  
20-P  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. James McMichael  
Technical Director  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Barbara Means  
Human Resources  
Research Organization  
1100 South Washington  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Robert Mislevy  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. William Montague  
NPRDC Code 13  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Ms. Kathleen Moreno  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 62  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Headquarters, Marine Corps  
Code MP1-20  
Washington, DC 20380

Dr. W. Alan Nicewander  
University of Oklahoma  
Department of Psychology  
Oklahoma City, OK 73069

Deputy Technical Director  
NPRDC Code 01A  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Director, Training Laboratory,  
NPRDC (Code 05)  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

1987/10/16

Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Director, Manpower and Personnel  
Laboratory,  
NPRDC (Code 06)  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Director, Human Factors  
& Organizational Systems Lab,  
NPRDC (Code 07)  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Fleet Support Office,  
NPRDC (Code 301)  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Library, NPRDC  
Code P201L  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Commanding Officer,  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 2627  
Washington, DC 20390

Dr. Harold F. O'Neill, Jr.  
School of Education - WPH 801  
Department of Educational  
Psychology & Technology  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031

Dr. James Olson  
WICAI, Inc.  
1875 South State Street  
Orem, UT 84057

Office of Naval Research,  
Code 1142CS  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000  
(6 Copies)

Office of Naval Research,  
Code 125  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Assistant for MPT Research,  
Development and Studies  
OP 0187  
Washington, DC 20370

Dr. Judith Orasanu  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Jesse Orlansky  
Institute for Defense Analyses  
1801 N. Beauregard St.  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Randolph Park  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Blvd.  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Wayne M. Patience  
American Council on Education  
GED Testing Service, Suite 20  
One Dupont Circle, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. James Paulson  
Department of Psychology  
Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207

Administrative Sciences Department,  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Department of Operations Research,  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Mark D. Reckase  
ACT  
P. O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Malcolm Ree  
AFHRL/MP  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Barry Riegelhaupt  
HumRRO  
1100 South Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Carl Ross  
CNET-PDCD  
Building 90  
Great Lakes NIC, IL 60088

## Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Dr. J. Ryan  
Department of Education  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Fumiko Samejima  
Department of Psychology  
University of Tennessee  
3108 AustinPeay Bldg.  
Knoxville, TN 37916-0900

Mr. Drew Sands  
NPRDC Code 62  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Lowell Schoer  
Psychological & Quantitative  
Foundations  
College of Education  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Mary Schratz  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Dan Segall  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. W. Steve Sellman  
OASD(MRA&L)  
2B269 The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Dr. Kazuo Shigemasu  
7-9-24 Kugenuma-Kaigan  
Fujisawa 251  
JAPAN

Dr. William Sims  
Center for Naval Analysis  
4401 Ford Avenue  
P.O. Box 16268  
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko  
Manpower Research  
and Advisory Services  
Smithsonian Institution  
801 North Pitt Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Richard E. Snow  
Department of Psychology  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94306

Dr. Richard Sorensen  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Paul Speckman  
University of Missouri  
Department of Statistics  
Columbia, MO 65201

Dr. Judy Spray  
ACT  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Martha Stocking  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Peter Stoloff  
Center for Naval Analysis  
200 North Beauregard Street  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. William Stout  
University of Illinois  
Department of Statistics  
101 Illini Hall  
125 South Wright St.  
Champaign, IL 61820

Maj. Bill Strickland  
AF/MPXOA  
4E168 Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330

Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan  
Laboratory of Psychometric and  
Evaluation Research  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003

Mr. Brad Sympson  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

1987/10/16

Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

Dr. John Tangney  
AFOSR/NL  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka  
CERL  
252 Engineering Research  
Laboratory  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Maurice Tatsuoka  
220 Education Bldg  
1310 S. Sixth St.  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. David Thissen  
Department of Psychology  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66044

Mr. Gary Thomasson  
University of Illinois  
Educational Psychology  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Robert Tsutakawa  
University of Missouri  
Department of Statistics  
222 Math. Sciences Bldg.  
Columbia, MO 65211

Dr. Ledyard Tucker  
University of Illinois  
Department of Psychology  
603 E. Daniel Street  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Vern W. Urry  
Personnel R&D Center  
Office of Personnel Management  
1900 E. Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20415

Dr. David Vale  
Assessment Systems Corp.  
2233 University Avenue  
Suite 310  
St. Paul, MN 55114

Dr. Frank Vicino  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Howard Wainer  
Division of Psychological Studies  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Ming-Mei Wang  
Lindquist Center  
for Measurement  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Thomas A. Warm  
Coast Guard Institute  
P. O. Substation 18  
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Dr. Brian Waters  
Program Manager  
Manpower Analysis Program  
HumRRO  
1100 S. Washington St.  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. David J. Weiss  
N660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Ronald A. Weitzman  
NPS, Code 54Wz  
Monterey, CA 92152-6800

Major John Welsh  
AFHRL/MOAN  
Brooks AFB, TX 78223

Dr. Douglas Wetzel  
Code 12  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Rand R. Wilcox  
University of Southern  
California  
Department of Psychology  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

1987/10/16

Educational Testing Service/Mislevy

German Military Representative  
ATTN: Wolfgang Wildegrube  
Streitkraefteamt  
D-5300 Bonn 2  
4000 Brandywine Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Anthony R. Zara  
National Council of State  
Boards of Nursing, Inc.  
625 North Michigan Ave.  
Suite 1544  
Chicago, IL 60611

Dr. Bruce Williams  
Department of Educational  
Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Hilda Wing  
NRC GF-176  
2101 Constitution Ave  
Washington, DC 20418

Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff  
Navy Personnel R & D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Mr. John H. Wolfe  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. George Wong  
Biostatistics Laboratory  
Memorial Sloan-Kettering  
Cancer Center  
1275 York Avenue  
New York, NY 10021

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Kentaro Yamamoto  
Computer-based Education  
Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Wendy Yen  
CTB/McGraw Hill  
Del Monte Research Park  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Joseph L. Young  
Memory & Cognitive  
Processes  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550